

**Proposed Changes in Title II Reporting Requirements
Comparison of Provisions Contained in
H.R. 2211 and S. 1793**

Issue	H.R. 2211 (Gingrey)	S. 1793 (Kennedy)
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	<p>Maintains existing structure for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants: 1) State Grants; 2) Partnership Grants; 3) Recruitment Grants</p> <p>Purpose is more aligned with goals and objectives of NCLB.</p> <p>Evaluation System: contains language that requires that any state that receives a state grant must develop and utilize a system to evaluate annually the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and professional development activities within the state in producing gains in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ the teacher’s annual contributions to improving student academic achievement as measured by state academic assessments required by NCLB. ♦ teacher mastery of the academic subjects they teach, as measured by pre-post participation tests of teacher knowledge. <p>It requires the state to use the evaluation system to evaluate activities carried out with funds provided by the state grants, and the quality of its teacher education program.</p>	<p>Maintains existing structure for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants: 1) State Grants; 2) Partnership Grants; 3) Recruitment Grants</p> <p>Purpose of the grants is more aligned with goals and objectives of NCLB.</p> <p>Pedagogy plays a more prominent role in S. 1793 than in H.R. 2211.</p>

Reporting Requirements	<p>Institutional reporting would change in a significant manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who institutions report on would change from existing requirements of “program completers” to all students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program. <p>State reporting would also change in a significant manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pass rate data would be based on new 50 percent program completer requirements consistent with what is proposed for institutional reporting. Language regarding state criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs has been revised to include: 1) teacher candidate skills and academic content knowledge (language slightly revised to focus on “academic content knowledge”, and 2) evidence of gains in student academic achievement (an entirely new requirement). 	<p>Institutional reporting is nearly identical to current law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pass rate data would still be required of only those who are program completers. <p>However, several new requirements would be added for state reporting. Given the types of data listed, it is conceivable that institutions would also be required to provide some of the data necessary for completion of the state report. The additional data that would be required includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement rates for teacher education program graduates would need to be calculated and reported by states. States would be required to report the percentage of full-time faculty in IHEs who teach classes offered by a school of education. States would be required to track graduates three years after graduation from a teacher preparation program.
-------------------------------	---	--